

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2017

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14 December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/17/3181851

1 Daventer Drive, Stanmore, HA7 3TJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr C Chavda against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2024/17, dated 2 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension.
-

Application for Costs

1. An application for costs was made by the appellant against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey side extension at 1 Daventer Drive, Stanmore, HA7 3TJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2024/17, dated 2 May 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drg Nos PL-01 & PL-02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows/doors shall be installed in the flank wall of the development hereby permitted.

Procedural Matter

3. The application was made in the name of Mr C Chadva. The appeal was made in the name of Mr C Chavda. I have recorded the appellant's name as it was

given on the appeal form as this is consistent with how it has been spelt in other correspondence. I am satisfied that the difference is due to a simple typographical error and that the applicant and the appellant are one and the same person.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and wider area, and upon the living conditions at 77 The Highway with regard to visual impact.

Reasons

5. No 1 is a two-storey dwelling forming part of a linked row of three properties along the south side of Daventer Drive and which leads into a larger residential estate of broadly similar house types. The proposal is to demolish an existing single-storey garage to one side, and which adjoins the rear garden boundary to 77 The Highway, and to erect a slightly recessed two-storey side extension including an integral garage with a lean-to roof over its shallow single-storey projection to the front.
6. The Council properly recognise that the extension would be subservient to the original dwelling, with its main two-storey element recessed behind the property's front building line and with a subsequent lower ridge height. They also accept that the extension would be proportionate in terms of its overall size. Nevertheless, they are of the view that the extension would appear unduly disruptive to the established pattern of development in the street scene by virtue of its prominence and change to the appearance of No 1.
7. As with any extension, the appearance of the host property will change. Whilst there is repetition to the design of the properties along Daventer Drive and throughout the estate, there is no importance derived from this that imposes any sense of regimentation to the street scene. The change to No 1 does not therefore inevitably equate to harm.
8. The proposal would harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building, appropriately reflecting its form and detailing, including using matching materials. No 1 is at the end of a linked row of houses, and the extension would be on its outside elevation. Consequently, there would be no closing of any important gap between two neighbouring dwellings and no potential for the creation of any terracing effect. In addition, I am satisfied that the extension would not appear overly prominent within the street scene due to the main two-storey element being set back from the front wall of the property.
9. When seen from the rear garden to No 77 and in the outlook from that property, the extension would appear as a well-considered and integrated part of No 1. Although the two-storey scale of No 1 would be projected closer towards No 77, I am not persuaded that it would appear visually obtrusive or in any other way harmful to the living conditions of these neighbouring occupiers.
10. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of No 1 or the wider street scene, and that it would not adversely impact upon the living conditions at 77 The Highway. There would therefore be

no conflict with the Council's guidelines, as set out within their *Design and Layout Guidance for Householder Development*, which is part of the Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD, adopted in 2010, and no conflict with part B to Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) or with Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies (2013), both of which deal with the quality of design and the need for development to respect the local context, including the amenity of neighbouring land. Neither would there be conflict with Policies 7.4B or 7.6B of The London Plan (2016) or with the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as they deal with similar issues.

Conditions

11. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. To safeguard the character and appearance of the area it is necessary to ensure that the new works are carried out in materials to match the existing. To safeguard the living conditions at 77 The Highway it is necessary to prevent any openings being created in the flank wall of the extension.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR